

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignita 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/995,916	11/28/2001	Huub Van Aert	27500-14	27500-14 1168	
7	7590 08/28/2003				
Joseph T. Guy Ph.D			EXAMINER		
201 W. McBee			ZALUKAEVA	ZALUKAEVA, TATYANA	
Greenville, SC	29603		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1713		
			DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	12
Advisory Action	09/995,916	AERT ET AL.	
, . , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Tatyana Zalukaeva	1713	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 08 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Tetaching of time may be abbricant under 27 CFR 4.126(c). The	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti IE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The apporting the final of t	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>08/08</u> Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requesting requesting the application in condition for allowance becaused. 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.		
 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we 			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3-5 and 13-25</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>12</u> .			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen			
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

Tatyana Zalukaeva Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1713





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment to independent claim 13 introduces new range of a surfactant concentration, and a com[pletely new limitation on the particle sizes of the latex. This will require new search and consideration. Furthermore, the proposed amend,ment idf enterd first of all will raise at the leat an objection, if not rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. because the word to after the words "by weight" in claim 13 renders it unclkear.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons set forth in the Final Office Action on the merits. In response to Applicants arguments on a prematurely of a Final rejection, Applicants arguments are not persuasive, and with all due respect to Applicants' opinion, Applicants attention is drawn to MPEP 706.07 (a) which explains that the final rejection is necessitated by Applicants amendment. In the instant case the independent claim 1 was replaced by independent claim 13 on which all other claims became dependent, and this claim significantly narrowed down the claims removing cobalt complexes from the scope of claim, and leaving ONLY dimers as chain transfer agents. Therefore, it is Applicants amendment that necessitated new grounds of rejection. Applicants are cordially invited to read MPEP 706.07 9a), because the excerpt cited by Applicants only partially cited the relevant place of MPEP. Applicants arguments with regard to prior art rejection are entirely based on the new limitation on the particle sizes that has not been entered.